

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

In the Office Action at item 3, the Examiner objected to the drawings. In order to overcome this objection, Applicant adds Figure 6 and amends the specification. No new matter is added. Approval of FIG. 6 is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the title, specification, drawings, and claims 6, 9, 10, 19, and 24 have been amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1-24 are pending and under consideration.

Objection to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the title because the title is not descriptive. Applicant amends the title to obviate this objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings because the drawings do not include all of the features presented in the claims.

Applicant submits new Figure 6 and amends the specification to overcome this objection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 10 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The Office Action rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. Claim 10 is amended to correct a typographical error. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 10 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Office Action rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 10 is amended to correct a typographical error. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 9, 11-15, 19, 21, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,714,496 issued to Park et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Park-496"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Park-496 does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "positioning a pickup unit at a first predetermined location on an inner circumference of an optical disc; radiating light on the optical disc at the first predetermined location; ...measuring a time T1 at which a first focus error signal, generated when light is reflected from a recording layer of the optical disc, is output" and "positioning the pickup at a second predetermined location on an outer circumference of the

optical disc; radiating light on the optical disc at the second predetermined location;...
measuring a time T2 at which a second focus error signal, generated when light is reflected from
the recording layer of the optical disc, is output,” as recited in claims 1 and 21. Park-496 does
not disclose the predetermined locates on the inner surface and outer surface of the optical disc.
Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 1 and 21 are patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these references, claims 2-5 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Similarly, Park-496 does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “a control unit which, measures a time T1 at which the focus error signal generation unit outputs a focus error signal generated when light is reflected from a recording layer of the optical disc by radiating light on a predetermined location on an inner circumference of the optical disc and moving the pickup unit towards the optical disc, measures a time T2 when the focus error signal generation unit outputs a focus error signal generated when light is reflected from the recording layer of the optical disc by radiating light on a predetermined location on an outer circumference of the optical disc and moving the pickup unit towards the optical disc,” as recited in claim 11. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

Claims 12-15 and 19 depend from claim 11 and include all of the features of claim 11. Therefore, for at least these references, claims 12-15 and 19 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

Similarly, Park-496 does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “recording a time T1 that a pickup unit takes to focus on an optical disc recording surface at a first position on an inner circumference of the optical disk; recording a time T2 that the pickup unit takes to focus on the optical disc recording surface at a second position on an outer circumference of the optical disk,” as recited in claim 24. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 24 is patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

Park-496 does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “compensating for the tilt angle of the optical disc by adjusting a pickup angle of the pickup unit to correspond to the tilt angle at the predetermined location of the optical disc using a jitter signal,” as recited in claim 9.

Instead, Park-496 discloses an optical disc 1 inserted onto a turntable and a turntable 10 secured on a regulation plate 80 integrally formed with a spindle motor 70 which rotates the turntable 10 which slidingly contacts a spiral slant cam 60. The regulation plate 80 ascends and descends according to rotation of the spiral slant cam 60. Accordingly, the optical pickup unit 20

appears to be stationary, and the optical disc moves to re-calibrate a tilt between the optical pickup unit 20 and the disc 1 in Park-496. However, Park-496 does not disclose using a jitter signal to compensate for the tilt angle. Therefore, claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 6-8 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent Publication 2002/0060964 to Park et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Park-964"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Park-964 does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "determining the pickup angle at each of the plurality of locations at which a value of the jitter signal has a minimum value," as recited in claim 6. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 6 is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 6 and include the features of claim 6. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 7 and 8 are patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 16-18, 20, and 22-23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Further, the Office Action rejects claims 16-18, 20, and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Park-496 in view of Park-964. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Park-496 and Park-964, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a control unit which, measures a time T1 at which the focus error signal generation unit outputs a focus error signal generated when light is reflected from a recording layer of the optical disc by radiating light on a predetermined location on an inner circumference of the optical disc and moving the pickup unit towards the optical disc, measures a time T2 when the focus error signal generation unit outputs a focus error signal generated when light is reflected from the recording layer of the optical disc by radiating light on a predetermined location on an outer circumference of the optical disc and moving the pickup unit towards the optical disc," as recited in claim 11.

Park-964 does not cure the deficiencies of Park-496. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 11 is patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

Claims 16-18 and 20 depend from claim 11 and include all of the features of claim 11.

Therefore, for at least these references, claims 16-18 and 20 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited references

Park-496 and Park-964, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "positioning a pickup unit at a first predetermined location on an inner circumference of an optical disc; radiating light on the optical disc at the first predetermined location; ... measuring a time T1 at which a first focus error signal, generated when light is reflected from a recording layer of the optical disc, is output" and "positioning the pickup at a second predetermined location on an outer circumference of the optical disc; radiating light on the optical disc at the second predetermined location;... measuring a time T2 at which a second focus error signal, generated when light is reflected from the recording layer of the optical disc, is output," as recited in claims 22 and 23.

Park-964 does not cure the deficiencies of Park-496. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 22 and 23 are patentably distinguishable from the cited reference.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Summary

Claims 1-24 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

November 22, 2006

By:

Paul F. Daebeler

Paul F. Daebeler
Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501